

REMARKS

Status of the claims

Claims 1-7, 10, 35, 37, 38, 40-44, 47, and 72-75 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Toyama et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0139520) (hereinafter "Toyama"). In addition, claims 1-33, 35-70, and 72-75 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Toyama in view of Karagiannis et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,482,767) (hereinafter "Karagiannis").

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the indication that the subject matter of claims 34 and 71 are allowable.

Amendment summary

The subject matter of claim 8 and claim 4 have been incorporated into claims 1 and 2.

The subject matter of claim 45 has been incorporated into claim 41.

Claims 4, 8, and 45 have been canceled.

Claims 9-11 and 46 have been amended due to the amendments of claims 1, 2, and 41.

Claims 76-78 are added, and support for these claims is found in original claims 9-11.

No new matter is added by this Amendment, and Applicant respectfully submits that entry of the present Amendment is proper.

Response to rejections based on Toyama

As mentioned above, claims 1-7, 10, 35, 37, 38, 40-44, 47, and 72-75 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Toyama. In addition, claims 1-33, 35-70,

and 72-75 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Toyama in view of Karagiannis.

Applicant respectfully submits that Toyama, either alone or in combination with Karagiannis, does not anticipate or render obvious the presently claimed invention.

As an initial matter, Applicant respectfully submits that Toyama does not anticipate the presently claimed invention because Toyama does not disclose or suggest the use of a crosslinked polyvinyl acetyl resin. Applicant notes the subject matter of claim 8 has been incorporated into independent claims 1 and 2. In addition, the subject matter of claim 45 has been incorporated into independent claim 41. Accordingly, as recognized by the Examiner, Toyama does not disclose or teach the presently recited invention that includes a crosslinked polyvinyl acetyl resin. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that Toyama does not anticipate the presently claimed invention. Applicant respectfully requests the reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 102 rejection based on Toyama.

Applicant notes that a laminated glass having a low HIC value, as recited in claims 1 and 2, can be achieved when using an interlayer film for laminated glasses which can absorb an impact. An interlayer film for laminated glasses as recited in the present claims is an interlayer film which contains a plasticizer for interlayer films in an amount of 40 parts by weight or more per 100 parts by weight of crosslinked polyvinyl acetal resin. It is possible to reduce the HIC value of the laminated glass by using the interlayer film for laminated glasses, in which such a large amount of plasticizer for interlayer films is blended.

The presently recited interlayer film comprises a crosslinked polyvinyl acetal resin. As a result, by using crosslinked polyvinyl acetal resin as a matrix, a lower HIC value can be achieved.

Applicant respectfully submits that Karagiannis does not remedy the deficiency in Toyama. In particular, the disclosure within Karagiannis of polyvinyl acetyl resin particles does not render obvious the presently recited matrix of polyvinyl acetyl resin. The difference may be illustrated by comparing Examples 12 and 13 of the present specification. In particular, Example 13 illustrates the use of a crosslinked polyvinyl acetal resin as a matrix, whereas Example 12 illustrates the use of a composition that includes rubber particles. As can be seen from Table 1, the HIC value of Example 13, which utilizes a cross-linked polyvinyl as you will resin is a matrix, is lower than that of Example 12, which incorporates rubber particles.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the polyvinyl acetyl resin particles disclosed in Karagiannis do not remedy the deficiency of the teaching of a polyvinyl acetyl resin in Toyama. Applicant therefore respectfully requests the reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejection.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Travis B. Ribar
Registration No. 61,446

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: April 17, 2008